

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Alfrigh Williams,)	C/A No. 5:16-cv-03192-BHH-KDW
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
Ruby Brockenberry, Gary Leamon,)	
Charles Reeves, C West, Stacy Carter, E)	
Bittinger)	
)	
Defendant.)	

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis*, brought this action alleging violations of his constitutional rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On December 27, 2016, Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. ECF No. 32. In an order the court advised Plaintiff of the importance of such motions and of the need for him to file an adequate response pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975). ECF No. 33. Plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to respond adequately, the Defendants' Motion may be granted, thereby ending this case.

Notwithstanding the specific warning and instructions set forth in the court's *Roseboro* order Plaintiff has failed to respond to the Motion. As such, it appears to the court that he does not oppose the Motion and wishes to abandon this action against Defendants. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff is directed to advise the court whether he wishes to continue with this case and to file a response to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment by **March 2, 2017**. Plaintiff is further advised that if he fails to respond, this action will be

recommended for dismissal with prejudice for failure to prosecute. *See Davis v. Williams*, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.



February 2, 2017
Florence, South Carolina

Kaymani D. West
United States Magistrate Judge